

STATINTL

CLANDESTINE SERVICE SENIOR SEMINAR

CRITIQUE

1. As you know, the first four days of the Seminar were designed as a sort of backdrop to the problem-tackling weeks, providing: a. a brief survey of developments since World War II and of present international conditions, with particular emphasis on those forces and trends which pose problems for U. S. national objectives and security; b. a look at ourselves and prospects for the future -- the CS in a changing world; and c. an up-to-date and candid look at "the national security process" and the CS role therein. Did you find this portion of the Seminar useful?

- a. No _____
- b. Yes, to a slight degree _____
- c. Yes, to a moderate degree _____
- d. Yes, to a good degree ✓
- e. Yes, to an exceptional degree _____

2. Quite apart from the CS Senior Seminar, do you think that a brief (2 or 3 day) ^{Symposium} ~~seminar~~ on The CS in a Changing World along the same lines as this backdrop portion would be useful and interesting to other senior CS officers?

*but more directly
structured than CS*

CRITIQUE (cont.)

Page Two

- a. No _____
- b. Yes, to a slight degree _____
- c. Yes, to a moderate degree ✓
- d. Yes, to a good degree _____
- e. Yes, to an exceptional degree _____

3. Unfortunately, agenda changes and other factors beyond our control did not permit the timely dissemination of complete reading kits. Except for receiving reading material in piecemeal fashion, did you find the documents useful to your consideration of the problems discussed?

- a. No ✓
- b. Yes, to a slight degree _____
- c. Yes, to a moderate degree _____
- d. Yes, to a good degree _____
- e. Yes, to an exceptional degree _____

4. Do you have any suggestions for changes or improvements in the techniques of the Seminar, e.g., in the method of preparing the papers, the handling of outside contributions by guest speakers, etc.?

By identifying more specifically the topics to be discussed, and providing reading to prepare more profoundly for these discussions, greater depth and emphasis could be given to the subjects. I would suggest for future seminars more use of team preparation of positions and group confrontation on controversial matters. I do not believe the reading is only necessary if the participants are interested with an eye to their knowledge of the topics under discussion.

CRITIQUE (cont.)

Page Three

5. Do you have any suggestions for changes and improvements in the administration of the Seminar, including space and location?

Space and location were excellent. The noise of the air conditioner was a hindrance.

6. Do you think the size of the group was appropriate? If not, please explain.

Yes, but it could have been more productive if divided occasionally into working teams.

7. Do you think that Seminar members were well selected to meet the requirements placed on the Seminar? If not, do you have any suggestions for improving the composition of any such future Seminar?

Yes, fortuitously. It would perhaps inspire more enthusiasm if there were a greater degree of eagerness to be a seminar member.

CRITIQUE (cont.)

Page Four

8. Did you find the Seminar topics pertinent and challenging?

What topics would you have included as "vital, current problems of

the CS?" *I was not pleased with the selection of topics - or at least with the way they were phrased. Structure of the CS should follow functions. A better approach would have been, "What are the most serious problems of the CS and how can they be overcome?" The number of these problems could be limited, but by this approach you would concern yourself first with the substance of a problem and in working out its solution you may or may not have come up with structural changes. "Emerging threats" was of no value in discussion - Contribution too broad. Over*

9 Do you have any other comments on the Seminar which might be useful as a basis for improvement or modification of any future Seminar?

It appeared to me that there was inadequate controversy in the seminar on matters that should have sparked argument - and probably did in the back rooms, but not in plenary sessions. By structuring the seminar into teams some improvement could be made. Also improvement perhaps could be made by a less arbitrary allocation of time to topics. In this seminar the problem was largely overcome by being ignored.

I very much enjoyed the session, was exhilarated by the experience and wisdom of my colleagues, and hope that I shall be able to project the same into the development of my small element of the CS.